

**Remarks/Arguments:**

**I. Objection to the drawings:**

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, stating that the “pressure means” for Claim 8 and the “venturi” for Claim 9 are not shown in the drawings. Claim 9 has been cancelled herein, thereby obviating the objection with respect to the venture limitation. As discussed below, Claim 1 has been amended herein to include the limitations of Claim 8. It is respectfully submitted that the pressure means now contained in amended claim 1 is adequately shown in the figures, namely Figs. 8 and 9. The Examiner’s attention is directed to page 11, lines 19-24 of the original specification, wherein with reference to Figs. 8 and 9, is described the air passages **40**, duct **41**, and an extraction fan which, in operation, create a low pressure in the passages **40**, drawing air out of the tank **19**. It is submitted that the combination of these features provides adequate support and disclosure of the “pressure means” that is now contained in amended claim 8. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

**II. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §112:**

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Due to typographical errors in the Examiner’s action on page 3, first paragraph with respect to Claim 10, the Examiner’s objection is not entirely clear. Assuming, however, that the Examiner is contending there is no support for a body having a substantially inclined configuration when the apparatus is in use, as defined in Claim 10, the Examiner’s attention is directed to page 12, lines 1-5 of the original specification. Referring to Fig. 10 in this section of the specification, a chamber **43** (which is just another form of the body **10**) is clearly described as being supported in an inclined configuration, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that Claim 10 is adequately provided in the description. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperation relationships of the elements. As discussed below, the limitations of Claim 8 have been incorporated into Claim 1, such that amended Claim 1 more clearly defines the relationship between the “pressure means” and the “body.” Claim

9 has been cancelled herein, thereby obviating this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejections with respect to Claim 8 is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 10-14, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harris, et al. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 2-5 as well as Claim 8, the latter dependent claim including all of the limitations of Claim 1 plus the provision of a flow means for increasing flow of air from the atmosphere through the enclosed space, the flow means further including a pressure means to alter pressure within the apparatus to increase the flow air. It is respectfully submitted that this latter feature of Claim 8 is not disclosed in Harris, et al, and thus Claim 1, as now amended, is allowable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 10-13, which are dependent upon Claim 1, are also patentable in view of the cited art.

The Examiner has submitted that Claims 17-19 and Claims 22-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims. Claim 14 has been amended herein to include the limitations of Claim 17, with Claim 17 subsequently cancelled. Claim 18 has been amended to change its dependency from Claim 17 to Claim 14, accordingly. Claim 20 has been amended herein to include the limitations of Claims 21 and 22, with Claims 21-22 being cancelled. The dependencies of Claims 23-24 have been amended accordingly.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over the cited art.

III. Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

The Examiner has rejected Claim 26 as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Okuda et al. In view of the amendment to Claim 1, upon which Claim 26 is dependent, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 26 is also in allowable condition.

IV. Conclusion:


In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, it is hereby submitted that Claims 1, 10-14, 18-20, and 23-26 are allowable over the art, and that a Notice of Allowance be forthcoming.

The Applicant also submits an Information Disclosure Statement per 37 C.F.R. §1.97(c)(2). The fee of \$180 is enclosed herein (37 C.F.R. §1.17(p)).

Finally, please make note that the Applicant's undersigned attorney of record has a new phone number: (239) 466-4355 (voice). The facsimile phone number, email address, and mailing address remain the same.

Date: 11/15/07

Respectfully submitted,



Laura G. Barrow  
Reg. No. 35,437

**Send all correspondence to:**

Laura G. Barrow  
P.O. Box 215  
Estero, Florida 33928-0215  
Tel: (239) 466-4355  
Fax: (239) 466-8554  
Email: LGBPATENT@AOL.COM

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 15, 2007.



Laura G. Barrow